



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*ck*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/670,219

09/26/2003

Naotaka Yumoto

030712-14

6834

22204

7590

10/06/2006

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

401 9TH STREET, NW

SUITE 900

WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER

HUR, JUNG H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2824

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/670,219

Applicant(s)

YUMOTO, NAOTAKA

Examiner

Jung (John) H. Hur

Art Unit

2824

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2006 (RCE).  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 21-29 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 31 July 2006 (After-Final Amendment) has been entered.

### ***After-Final Amendment***

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's previous After-Final Amendment, filed 31 July 2006. The changes and remarks disclosed therein have been considered and entered in view of the RCE noted above. The remarks, filed 17 July 2006, have also been considered.

No claims have been cancelled or added by Amendment. Therefore, claims 1-29 remain pending in the application.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

3. Claims 6-20 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 11 February 2005.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the specification, on page 9, line 1, "Fig. 3" appears to be in error; it will be understood as --Fig. 2--.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, it is not clear whether "a predetermined voltage being supplied to a predetermined terminal" in lines 6-7 is referring to "a signal ... inputted to the predetermined terminal" in line 8. For the purpose of further examination, "a predetermined voltage" in lines 6-7 will be understood as that of "a signal" in line 8.

Regarding claims 21 and 26, in lines 7-9, "a predetermined voltage being supplied to a predetermined terminal in the address input terminals in response to the address signals received thereto" is not clear. For the purpose of further examination, "a predetermined voltage" in line 7 will be understood as that of one of "the address signals received thereto" in lines 8-9.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2824

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-5, 21, 23-26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art ("Admission") in view of McGibney et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,112,322) and McClure (U.S. Pat. No. 6,037,792).

Admission (for example, in the second paragraph on page 1 of the specification) discloses a nonvolatile semiconductor memory device comprising: a memory cell array having a plurality of memory cells and arranged in an array, the memory cells being connected to a plurality of bit lines and word lines (inherent); a plurality of address input terminals inputting a plurality of addresses thereto (inherent); a test mode circuit for outputting a test mode signal (implied, for example, to control the operations of column switches) according to a predetermined voltage (associated with "a signal from the exterior") being supplied to a predetermined terminal (implied, since the signal is from the exterior) when a signal ("a signal from the exterior") is inputted to the predetermined terminal; a row decoder (inherent); applying an excess voltage ("a test mode voltage" of 8V, above the normal level of 5V) for a test to all said word lines in response to said test mode signal; a column decoder (including "column switches") connected to said test mode circuit and setting all said bit lines to a non-selecting state ("a turning-off state") in response to said test mode signal; a control signal input terminal for receiving a control signal (inherent; such as RAS, CAS, R/W, etc.) and a control circuit connected to this control signal

Art Unit: 2824

input terminal (inherent, for example, to control read/write operations); and an address buffer connected to the address input terminals, the row decoder and the column decoder (inherent).

However, Admission does not disclose that the predetermined terminal is that among or in the address input terminals; and a monitor terminal (or pad) connected to said test mode circuit and outputting said test mode signal. Further, Admission is not clear that said row decoder is connected to said test mode circuit and applies said excess voltage to all said word lines.

McClure, for example in Fig. 1, discloses outputting a test mode signal (for example, /BURN-IN MODE signal) when a signal is inputted to a predetermined terminal among or in the address input terminals (i.e., use of an address pin to control entry into the test mode; see, for example, column 5, lines 52-61). McClure further discloses a monitor terminal or pad (48 or 54) for outputting the test mode signal (via 52 and 50; see also column 3, lines 22-40 and column 5, lines 37-52).

McGibney, for example in Fig. 4, discloses a row decoder (402) connected to a test mode circuit (including CTRL) and applies an excess voltage (above VCC; see for example column 2, lines 10-15, column 4, lines 47-56) to all word lines (see for example column 2, line 60 through column 3, lines 10).

Since it was common and well known in the art to detect a predetermined signal on an existing address pin to enable a test mode (as exemplified by McClure and others), it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to enable the test mode of Admission via a signal on a predetermined terminal among or in the address input terminals, for the purpose of reducing the need for additional pins to enable a test mode and thus reducing the space and cost associated with providing additional pins.

Further, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a test mode monitor terminal (or pad), as in McClure, in the test mode circuit of Admission, for the purpose of ascertaining a test mode entry and exit and thus reducing test errors and increasing test quality (see also for example McClure, column 5, lines 40-44).

Further, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the row decoder connected to the test mode circuit of Admission such that the row decoder would select and apply the excess voltage to all the word lines (as in McGibney), for the purpose of providing a greater flexibility for stress testing by being able to control the selection of the word lines, while preventing power surges (see for example McGibney column 2, line 47 through column 3, line 14).

9. Claims 2, 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art ("Admission") in view of McGibney et al. and McClure as applied to claims 1, 21 and 26 above, and further in view of Fontana et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,982,677).

The above Admission/McGibney/McClure combination discloses a memory device as in claims 1, 21 and 26 above, with the exception of a select line connected to the drain of a memory cell, and a regulator connected to this select line and said test mode circuit and giving a predetermined bias electric potential to the drain of said memory cell.

Fontana, for example in Figs. 2 and 3, discloses a select line (Yms) connected to the drain of a memory cell (see 3 in Fig. 2), and a regulator (Fig. 3) connected to this select line and a

Art Unit: 2824

circuit (providing Vref and PGn), and giving a predetermined bias electric potential to the drain of said memory cell (see for example column 4, lines 26-37).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the drain voltage regulator, as in Fontana, in the device of the Admission/McGibney/McClure combination, such that the regulator would be connected to the test mode circuit and provide a test voltage to the drains of the memory cells, for the purpose of stabilizing the test voltage and reducing the testing time, and thus improving the test efficiency (see for example Fontana, column 3, lines 37-46; also, column 7, lines 24-28).

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments, filed 17 July 2006, with respect to the finality of the Office Action that was mailed 16 May 2006 are moot in light of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE), filed 16 August 2006.

11. Applicant's arguments filed 17 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 1, 21 and 26, Applicant argues, starting at the bottom of page 4, that "this disclosure [Applicant's admissions] clearly fails to set forth or remotely suggest that the test mode circuit outputs a test mode signal according to that a predetermined voltage being supplied to a predetermined terminal and a plurality of address input terminals. Additionally, Applicant's admissions fail to disclose or remotely suggest the monitor terminal...." Applicant further argues, at the top of page 5, that "[h]owever,... McClure neither



Art Unit: 2824

discloses nor remotely suggests that the test mode circuit outputs a test mode signal when a signal is inputted to a predetermined terminal among the address input terminals....” Applicant further argues, in the second paragraph on page 5, that “McGibney et al. neither discloses nor suggests that the test mode circuit outputs a test mode signal according to a predetermined voltage being supplied to a predetermined terminal in a plurality of address input terminals.” Applicant further argues, in the bottom half of page 5, that Fontana “does nothing to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings....”

In response, it is noted that Admission discloses a test mode circuit outputting a test mode signal according to a predetermined voltage being supplied to a predetermined terminal (see the rejections above). Admission does not disclose a monitor terminal and that the predetermined terminal is one of a plurality of address input terminals (see the rejections above). However, the McClure reference, not the McGibney reference nor the Fontana reference, was cited as disclosing the use of one of the address terminals for inputting a signal, as well as a monitor terminal (see the rejections above). Thus, it is the combination of at least Admission and McClure that discloses a test mode circuit for outputting a test mode signal according to a predetermined voltage being supplied to a predetermined terminal in the address input terminals when a signal is inputted to the predetermined terminal among the address input terminals, as recited in claims 1, 21 and 26 (see the rejections above). The McGibney reference was cited as disclosing a row decoder connected to a test mode circuit and applies an excess voltage to all word lines, recited in claim 1, 21 and 26 (see the rejections above). The Fontana reference was cited as disclosing the limitation of dependent claims 2, 22 and 27 (see the rejections above).

Art Unit: 2824

***Conclusion***

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung (John) H. Hur whose telephone number is (571) 272-1870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Elms can be reached on (571) 272-1869. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jhh



Jung (John) H. Hur  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2824